

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/577,694	05/22/2000	Anne Sorensen	Novo-029	3706
75	90 09/26/2002			
Robert B. Smith SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP Four Times Square			EXAMINER	
			HON, SOW FUN	
New York, NY 10036		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1772	6
			DATE MAILED: 09/26/2002	£

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		A &-
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/577,694	SORENSEN ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Sow-Fun Hon	1772
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover shee	t with the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repletion of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut.  - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status		by a reply be timely filed  f thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  BE ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·	
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ T	his action is non-final.	
Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-22</u> is/are pending in the application	n.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) 21 and 22 is/are wit	hdrawn from considerat	ion.
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.	
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b) objected to I	by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on		disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in re		
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		·
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.	C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	,	
1. Certified copies of the priority documen	nts have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority documen	nts have been received i	n Application No
Copies of the certified copies of the price application from the International B     See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a	a)).
14)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes	·	
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language pr 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes	rovisional application ha	s been received.
Attachment(s)	suc priority under 55 U.C	33 120 alidioi 121.
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interv	iew Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)
<ul> <li>1)</li></ul>	5) 🔲 Notice	e of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 09/577,694 Page 2

Art Unit: 1772

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

1. Claims 21-22 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Election of claims 1-20 was made without traverse in Paper No. 5 (filed 07/02/02).

### Claim Objections

- 2. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "compared t" should be retyped as "compared to". Appropriate correction is required.
- 3. Claim 19 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. In the instant case, the recitation in claim 1 should replace the phrase "a stopper as defined in claim 1".

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
  The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 5. Claims 4, 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear by what method the hardness has been measured. The ASTM method with the year attached must be provided.

Application/Control Number: 09/577,694 Page 3

Art Unit: 1772

6. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "substantially" is vague and indefinite.

7. Claims 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 17, the term "capable of" is vague and indefinite since it is indicative of intended use, and is not given any patentable weight. In claim 18, it is unclear what is meant by the claim limitation "applied force to the stopper is through a rod". Does it mean that a rod is used to push the stopper in?

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 9. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kasai et al. (US 4,444,330).

Kasai et al. teaches a stopper comprising 30 to 90 weight % partially crosslinked butyl based rubber and up to 30 weight % thermoplastic polyolefin. The polyolefin is taught to be polypropylene or polyethylene. The butyl based rubber is a halogenated one (column 1, lines 35-65 and column 3, lines 5-15) such as a bromobutyl rubber. Kasai et al. teaches that the butyl rubber alone is subject to permanent set and cannot provide a stopper for hermetically sealing a

Application/Control Number: 09/577,694

Art Unit: 1772

medical container (column 2, lines 15-65) thus teaching that a stopper made from a combination of the butyl rubber and another component provides for a hermetically sealed container resulting in a reduced leakage of substances compared to a stopper made from butyl rubber alone.

Because Kasai et al. teaches that the bromobutyl rubber is at least partially crosslinked, is blended with up to 30 % polypropylene or polyethylene, and that the stopper is injection molded, in the absence of clear comparative data, it is the examiner's position that the resultant stopper has a hardness of 40-80 Shore A.

Kasai et al. teaches a medical container with non-flexible walls (rigid) (column 1, lines 5-15). The figures show that the stopper has a circular cross-section, and that the container comprises a distal and a proximal end, and at least one wall defining an interior space for storing liquid medicament (figures and column 5, lines 40-60).

Even though product by process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985)*. In the instant case, the stopper is in the container, and any way of pushing the stopper in, whether the applied force to the stopper is through a rod or palm of a hand results in a stoppered container.

Application/Control Number: 09/577,694

Art Unit: 1772

Page 5

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Sow-Fun Hon whose telephone number is (703)308-3265. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Friday from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon, can be reached on (703)308-4251. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0661.

974 09/23/52

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINE